1

25

26

27

28

Judge Coughenour

2 3 4 5 6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 8 AT SEATTLE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 9 NO. CR06-296 JCC Plaintiff, 10 ORDER SEVERING v. DEFENDANT PRENTICE 11 FROM DEFENDANTS EL, EL DALE ALEXANDER PRENTICE, 12 and TRAN FOR TRIAL and VISA EL, CONTINUING TRIAL AS TO IBRAHIM ABDUL EL, DEFENDANT PRENTICE 13 HAO QUANG TRAN. 14 Defendants. 15 ) 16 This matter having come before the undersigned Court by joint motion (Dkt. Nos. 17 171, 174) of counsel, the United States through the United States Attorney for the 18 Western District of Washington, Susan M. Roe, Assistant United States Attorney for said 19 20 district, and the Defendants through counsel, Dale A. Prentice by and through Richard Troberman, Visa El by and through Kenneth Kanev, Ibrahim El by and through Howard 21 Ratner and Hao Tran by and through Ralph Hurvitz, the Court being fully advised in the 22 matter, now finds that: 23 The trial for defendant Dale A. Prentice shall be SEVERED from the trial for 24

Defendants Visa El, Ibrahim El and Hao Tran, which is scheduled for February 5, 2007.

2007 (Dkt. No. 173). Because Defendant Prentice faces charges significantly different

from those faced by the Defendants scheduled for trial on February 5, 2007 and because

Furthermore, Defendant Prentice has filed a speedy trial waiver through May 11,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

further Grand Jury presentation is anticipated in his case, the Court finds that the requested 90-day extension of Defendant Prentice's trial is appropriate. Failure to continue Defendant Prentice's trial would deny him adequate preparation by his attorney and would deny counsel reasonable time to prepare for trial or negotiate plea agreements. Due to these factors, exclusion of additional time as to Defendant Prentice under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv) is appropriate, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. The Court further finds that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and Defendant Prentice in a speedy trial, within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A). The proposed continuance of Defendant Prentice's trial does not appear to prejudice any party. Accordingly, the trial for Defendant Prentice shall be CONTINUED to April 23, 2007. The time between the date of this Order and the new trial date shall be excludable time under the Speedy Trial Act pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(8)(A) and 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv) as to Defendant Dale Alexander Prentice. Any additional pretrial motions as to Defendant Prentice must be filed no later than March 22, 2007. SO ORDERED this 29th day of January, 2007.

John C. Coughenour

United States District Judge